DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 300 353 SP 030 658

AUTHOR Gilman, David A.; Sommer, Jeanne
TITLE The Summative Evaluation. Teachers Teaching Teachers. A Project in Staff Development for Improving Teacher Effectiveness.
INSTITUTION Indiana State Univ., Terre Haute. Professional School Services.
SPONS AGENCY Indiana State Dept. of Education, Indianapolis.; Vigo County School Corp., Terre Haute, Ind.
PUB DATE Aug 88
NOTE 31p.; For related documents, see SP 030 656-659.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitude Measures; Collegiality; Elementary Secondary Education; *Peer Teaching; *Program Evaluation; *Staff Development; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS *Teachers Teaching Teachers

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of Teachers Teaching Teachers, a peer coaching program, upon public school educators' attitudes toward various professional and personal factors. A total of 27 educators participated from November, 1987 to May, 1988. At the conclusion of the study, tests were administered to all participants. Two attitude surveys were also administered to students to determine their perception of their teacher's effectiveness. A TESA Program Evaluation Survey was also administered to the participants. The mean scores were compared to determine the project's effectiveness. The results indicated that the teachers were performing the objectives of the program as demonstrated by the post test scores. The program appears to have been effective in improving teacher attitude, enhancing collegial support, and in increasing the students' perception of their teachers' effectiveness. Project participants indicated general approval of the project and the instruction they received. They were less enthusiastic about lessons on higher level questions, touching, and desisting. Statistical data from the study are displayed in tables and a copy of the questionnaire is appended. (Author/JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED300353

The Summative Evaluation

TEACHERS TEACHING TEACHERS: A Project in Staff Development for Improving Teacher Effectiveness

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. A. Gilman

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

INDIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

ISU

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

TERRE HAUTE
INDIANA

SP 030 658

The Summative Evaluation

TEACHERS TEACHING TEACHERS:
A Project in Staff Development
for Improving Teacher Effectiveness

Prepared for the
Vigo County School Corporation
961 Lafayette Avenue
Terre Haute, IN 47804

©

(A project made possible by an
Indiana Department of Education
Teacher Quality Grant)

by

David A. Gilman, Ph.D. and Jeanne Sommer
Professional School Services
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, Indiana 47809

August, 1988

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of Teachers Teaching Teachers, a peer coaching program, upon public school educators' attitudes toward various professional and personal factors.

A total of 27 educators participated from November, 1978 to May, 1988. At the conclusion of the study, tests were administered to all participants. Two attitude surveys were also administered to students to determine their perception of their teacher's effectiveness. A TESA Program Evaluation Survey was also administered to participants. The mean scores were compared to determine the project's effectiveness.

The results indicated that the teachers were performing the objectives of the program as demonstrated by the post test scores. The program appears to have been effective in improving teacher attitude, enhancing collegial support and in increasing the students' perception of their teachers' effectiveness.

Project participants indicated general approval of the project and the instruction they received. They were less enthusiastic about lessons on higher level questioning, touching, and desisting.

Background of the Problem

Professional mortality is eroding both the number and the quality of our nation's teachers. In an unprecedented fashion, the once revered teaching profession is now the target of potshots from sources as varied as the media, the Department of Education, and justifiably concerned parents. Combined with the inherent stress of the job, these factors cause approximately 50 percent of teachers to leave the profession within five years (p. 33). Further, Stone (1987) reveals that among the first to leave are the most academically able.

What can be done to stop the mass exodus of the "best and brightest?" What help can be given to those who are struggling on the front lines in our classrooms? Rodriguez and Johnstone (1986) remind us that "teaching can be a very lonely profession" (p. 99). As any strategist knows, a single soldier can never win the entire war. Just as the G.I. in the foxhole receives assistance, supplies, and guidance from an entire support network, so should the teacher be revitalized, encouraged, and challenged by a similar system.

One of the most effective methods of providing that system seems to be through a collegial support group. Within the confines of such a group, teachers could begin to think of one another as resources (Bang-Jensen, 1986, p. 62) and learn by sharing their successes and failures with one another (Westcott, 1987, p. 30). Colleagues, according to Alfonson and Goldsberry (1982), have "the value of proximity, immediacy, and a first-hand knowledge of the other's workspace" (p. 101). Who, then could be better equipped to help teachers maintain their current levels of effectiveness and challenge them to strive for higher levels than fellow teachers?

Unfortunately, administrators sometimes "fail to recognize the considerable knowledge and expertise in their own teaching staffs" (Westcott, 1987, p. 30). As a result, many inservice programs are one-day sessions which Smith-Westberry and Job (1986) believe are viewed by teachers as "disorganized, dull, and irrelevant to their needs" (p. 135). In addition, Rodriguez and Johnstone (1986) note that teachers resist having others "diagnosing and prescribing for them" (p. 87). Perhaps the worst failure of these inservice efforts is the lack of any follow-through (Van Cleaf & Reinhartz, 1984, p. 167). Obviously, real growth is more probable through a program that

offers "follow-up practice, coaching, and peer support" (Rodriguez & Johnstone, 1986, p. 88). The solution, then, would appear to be some type of collegial group.

Among the different approaches under the broad spectrum of peer collaboration, "coaching" is the one selected for this Vigo County study. Coaching, as defined by its originators, Joyce and Showers (Servatius & Young, 1985, p. 50), is "a follow-up by a supportive advisor who helps a teacher correctly apply skills learned in training." Servatius and Young (1985) were responsible for establishing a pilot program in Santa Clara County, California, through the Educational Development Center, which offers programs to 33 local school districts. The most productive outcome of the successful first year was that "teachers who receive both training and coaching are implementing the trained skills correctly and consistently" (p. 53). This contention is supported by others, including Martin Brooks (1985) who states that "peer teaming and peer observation are critical" (p. 26) to the implementation and success of the Cognitive Levels Matching Project in Shoreham, New York. Additionally, Van Cleaf and Reinhartz (1984) claim that the success of their "Perceivers and Non-Perceivers" program is largely due to the members of the teams coaching one another (p. 170).

Coaching is, ideally, an on-going process of teachers coaching or training one another (Showers, 1985, p. 44). It provides a uniquely individualized form of instruction which provides the advantage of being both emotionally and professionally supportive (Stone, 1987, p. 34). In fact, Showers (1985) says that coaching has several purposes:

1. To build a community of teachers who continuously engage in the study of their craft.
2. To develop the shared language and set of common understandings necessary for the collegial study of new knowledge and skills.
3. To provide a structure for the follow-up to training that is essential for acquiring new teaching skills and strategies (p. 33-34).

Although the presentation of every new skill begins with an assigned, trained coach, each team member, by the latter development of a skill, is able to be both coach and student. Through the process of coaching, teachers are brought to a point of collaboration and sharing, which, according to Bang-Jensen (1986), is an "effective, efficient way to improve instruction and to

encourage teacher growth" (p. 56). Confidence, both in themselves and in the support group, inevitably begins to have a positive effect on teachers' performances in the classroom and on their attitudes toward teaching and the educational environment.

Servatius and Young (1985) offer possible reasons for the success of coaching. The first is accountability, the fact that collegial support and commitment is in the same building, not in the central office. Second, support and companionship develop among the team members, extending beyond the learned skill. Third, specific feedback is offered so participants are encouraged in correct skill implementation and helped with observed difficulties (p. 53).

In response to a survey of inservice education, one consultant reported that his most successful results came from "continuous work with a school" (Tomlinson, 1986, p. 110). If an outside consultant has the best success when his work is done on an on-going basis, the apparent solution to teacher inservice training is to use those who are already present on a continuous basis and already familiar with the school, the personnel, and the needs. To be successful, however, such a program must, before preparation and presentation, determine the needs of the participants (Smith-Westberry, 1986, p. 135) and then reflect those needs. Additionally, proper follow-through will continue to supply both professional and emotional support. Just such an approach to peer coaching, the Teachers Teaching Teachers program, was used in the Vigo County study. The anticipated results are that the experimental group which participated in the coaching will indicate an adequate positive perception of their colleagues, their students, the administration, and themselves and will view their profession and the methods of staff development more favorably.

If Teachers Teaching Teachers is an effective staff development program, then the attitude and beliefs of participating teachers and their students should improve significantly.

Statement of the Problem

General statement of the problem: What effect will Teachers Teaching Teachers have on public school educators?

Specific statement of the problem: Will the Teachers Teaching Teachers program enhance, both personally and professionally, the attitudes and perceptions of the participants as well as their students' opinions of them?

Hypotheses: Following are the six hypotheses needed to test the effectiveness of the Teachers Teaching Teachers program:

1. Teachers Teaching Teachers participants will show adequate or above scores on an instrument which measures teaching strategy.

2. Teachers Teaching Teachers participants will show adequate or above scores in feeling tone.

3. Teachers Teaching Teachers participants will show adequate or above scores in causing students to experience success.

4. Elementary students of Teachers Teaching Teachers participants will rate their teachers' effectiveness as adequate or above.

5. Secondary students of Teachers Teaching Teachers will rate their teachers' effectiveness as adequate or above.

6. Participants will indicate positive opinions about the instruction they receive.

Method

Subjects. Twenty-seven professional educators participated in the training program. All were employed by the Vigo County School Corporation in Terre Haute, Indiana.

Treatment. All subjects attended regular sessions of the Teachers Teaching Teachers program. They were instructed by a cadre of teachers who had previously completed the training.

Assessment. Subjects were tested at the conclusion of the training. Students of the participants were similarly tested. The following affective measures were used to measure progress:

#	MEASUREMENT	ITEMS	TYPE OF INSTRUMENT
(1)	Teaching Strategy	10	Likert Scale
(2)	Feeling Tone	9	Likert Scale
(3)	Success	13	Likert Scale
(4)	Total of 1, 2, and 3	32	Likert Scale
(5)	Elementary Students Perception of their teachers	17	Likert Scale
(6)	Secondary Students Perception of their teachers	32	Likert Scale

In addition, an eleven item TESA Program Evaluation Survey was administered to 18 participants. Tests were machine scored. All measures have yielded reliabilities above .90 in previous administrations. Examples of each of the scales and the frequencies of responses are contained in Appendix B of this report.

Analysis. Summary results were analyzed by a chi square and a goodness of fit test. The Statistics with Finesse statistical packing was used to perform the statistical calculation. Results were tested at the .05, .01, .001, and the .0001 levels.

The Chi-Square Test was used to ascertain whether there was a difference between the obtained frequency of responses to the questionnaire and an hypothetical equal frequency of 20 percent of the answers for each response.

The goodness of fit test sought to determine whether the frequency of responses was normally distributed.

Responses to the TESA Program Evaluation Survey were totaled and averaged.

Results

Complete results are contained in Appendix A of this report. A summary of the results is contained in Tables IA and IB. Table II contains the frequency of responses from project participants. Tables III and IV contain the frequency of response from students whose teacher participated in the project. From the table, it can be observed that participants considered themselves to be adequately performing the teaching skills that the project sought to promote. Furthermore, teachers were rated as more than adequate in these skills by both elementary and secondary students. Both tests of statistical significance give evidence of the magnitude of the difference between adequate or average ratings and the above average ratings that were demonstrated by both the teachers and the students.

It is a fair generalization that all measures demonstrated that the project attained its goals in that the teachers are now performing their instructional tasks in a manner that the project attempted to encourage.

Results from the TESA Program Evaluation Survey are contained in Table V and Table VI. From Table V it can be observed that participants were generally receptive to the type of instruction they received. Participants seemed to be particularly impressed by the knowledge, understanding, and enthusiasm of their TESA instructors.

Table VI contains the frequencies of responses to questions which asked which units they considered most effective. They considered lessons on equal responding, providing clues, affirmation/correction, and praise to be most effective. There was less enthusiasm about lessons on higher level questioning, touching, and desisting.

Discussion

This study sought to demonstrate the effectiveness of a project called Teachers Teaching Teachers for the improvement of teacher morale and teacher and student attitudes toward teaching effectiveness. The particular techniques used for this project included a collegial support network and coaching. The results were positive. Both teachers and students gave ratings of adequate or above to teacher strategy, feeling tone, success of students, and teacher effectives.

The hope for a project such as Teachers Teaching Teachers are not only the short term gains, but the long term effects. If such a project is continually practiced within the school system not only teacher effectiveness but also teacher retention will be greatly improved.

Additionally, if students perceive their teachers as effective, potentially more learning may occur and the value of the teaching profession may increase in the public eye.

To determine the possibility and validity of such gains for schools, more studies need to be conducted. Once a Teachers Teaching Teachers project is implemented, it should be maintained and follow-up studies should be conducted to determine the long-term effects of this project.

References

Alfonso, R., & Goldsberry, L. (1982). Colleagueship in supervision. Supervision of Teaching, ASCD 1982 Yearbook. T. Sergiovanni, ed. 101.

Bang-Jensen, V. (1986). The view from next door: A look at peer "supervision". Improving Teaching, 1986 ASCD Yearbook. K. Zumwalt, ed. 51-62.

Brooks, M. (1985). A constructivist approach to staff development. Educational Leadership, 42 (3), 23-27.

Rodriguez, S., & Johnstone, K. (1986). Staff development through a collegial support group model. Improving Teaching, 1986 ASCD Yearbook. K. Zumwalt, ed. 87-99.

Servatius, J., & Young, S. (1985). Implementing the coaching of teaching. Educational Leadership, 42 (7), 50-53.

Showers, B. (1985). Teachers coaching teachers. Educational Leadership, 42 (7), 43-48.

Smith-Westberry, J., & Job, R. (1986). How to be a prophet in your own land: Providing gifted program inservice for the local district. Gifted Child Quarterly, 30 (3), 135-137.

Stone, B. (1987). Why beginning teachers fail - and what you can do about it. Principal, 67 (1), 33-35.

Tomlinson, S. (1986). A survey of participant expectations for inservice in education of the gifted. Gifted Child Quarterly, 30 (3), 110-113.

Van Cleaf, D., & Reinhartz, J. (1984). Perceivers and non-perceivers. The Clearing House, 58 (4), 167-170.

Westcott, D. (1987). Getting results from a one-day inservice program. Principal, 66 (5), 29-30.

Appendix A

Questionnaire Frequencies by Item

TABLE 1A
Summary Statistics for Responses to Questionnaire Items Used in the Study

	I Never Do This		Decreased		Stayed the Same		Increased		Done Regularly As Needed	
Professional Educators (N = 27)	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teaching Strategy (10 items)	0	0	1	0.4	105	39	72	27	92	34
Feeling Tone (9 items)	0	0	1	0.4	128	53	57	23	58	24
Success (13 items)	0	0	0	0	162	46	120	34	69	20
TOTAL SCORES (32 items)	0	0	2	0.2	395	46	249	29	219	25

	Yes		Sometimes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Elementary Students (N=24)						
Total Score	286	70	89	22	33	8

Secondary Students (N = 34)	All of the Time		Often		Sometimes		Seldom		Never	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total Score	331	30	233	21	267	24	163	15	115	11

Table 1B
Statistical Tests for Questionnaire Responses

	Chi Square		Goodness of Fit	
Professional Educators	X^2	Significance	X^2	Significance
Teaching Strategy	186.9	.0001	142.03	.0001
Feeling Tone	227.3	.0001	80.6928	.0001
Success	295.8	.0001	63.1233	.0001
Total Score	673.5	.0001	83.3314	.0001
Students				
Elementary Students				
Total Score	259.7	.0001	217.3676	.0001
Secondary Students				
Total Score	126.3	.0001	92.8600	.0001

Appendix A

Table II

Summary Statistics for Responses to Professional Educator Self Evaluation
(N = 27)

	A		B		C		D		E	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	0	0	0	0	7	24	12	44	8	30
2	0	0	1	4	11	41	10	37	5	19
3	0	0	0	0	8	30	7	24	12	44
4	0	0	0	0	10	37	9	33	8	30
5	0	0	0	0	14	52	3	11	10	37
6	0	0	0	0	11	41	8	30	8	30
7	0	0	0	0	11	41	2	7	14	52
8	0	0	0	0	11	41	5	19	11	41
9	0	0	0	0	9	33	7	24	11	41
10	0	0	0	0	13	48	9	33	5	19
Subtotal for Teaching Strategy	0	0	1	.4%	105	39%	72	27%	92	34%
Chi Square = 186.9				Significant at p < .0001						
Goodness of Fit Test = 142.03				Significant at p < .0001						

	A		B		C		D		E	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
11	0	0	0	0	15	56	4	15	8	30
12	0	0	0	0	12	44	6	22	9	33
13	0	0	0	0	17	63	4	15	7	24
14	0	0	0	0	16	59	4	15	7	24
15	0	0	0	0	7	24	14	52	6	22
16	0	0	0	0	9	33	9	33	9	33
17	0	0	0	0	16	59	6	22	5	19
18	0	0	1	4	16	59	7	24	3	11
19	0	0	0	0	20	74	3	11	4	15
Subtotal for Feeling Tone	0	0	1	.4%	128	53%	57	23%	58	24%
Chi Square = 227.3				Significant at p < .0001						
Goodness of Fit Test = 80.6928				Significant at p < .0001						

	A		B		C		D		E	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
20	0	-	0	-	11	41	11	41	5	19
21	0	-	0	-	18	67	3	11	6	22
22	0	-	0	-	12	44	6	22	9	33
23	0	-	0	-	9	33	9	33	9	33
24	0	-	0	-	9	33	14	52	4	15
25	0	-	0	-	13	48	8	30	6	22
26	0	-	0	-	12	44	9	33	6	22
27	0	-	0	-	8	30	12	44	7	24
28	0	-	0	-	10	37	12	44	5	19
29	0	-	0	-	12	44	11	41	4	15
30	0	-	0	-	17	63	7	24	3	11
31	0	-	0	-	16	59	8	30	3	11
32	0	-	0	-	15	56	10	37	2	7
Subtotal for Success	0	0%	0	0%	162	46%	120	34%	69	20%

Chi Square = 295.8 — Significant at $p < .0001$
Goodness of Fit Test = 63.1233 — Significant at $p < .0001$

Total for	0	0	2	2	395	395	249	249	219	219
		864		864		864		864		864

Chi Square = 673.5 — Significant at $p < .0001$
Goodness of Fit Test = 83.3314 — Signficant at $p < .0001$

Table III

Summary Statistics for Elementary Student Response to "About My Teacher"

(N = 24)

	<--------Favorable					
	Yes		Sometimes		No	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	10	41	12	50	2	8
2	18	75	4	17	2	8
3	13	54	7	29	4	17
4	4	17	12	50	8	33
5	22	92	2	8	0	0
6	24	100	0	0	0	0
7	17	81	6	6	1	4
8	16	67	8	33	0	0
9	22	96	1	4	0	0
10	14	58	8	33	2	6
11	7	29	8	33	9	38
12	17	81	3	13	4	17
13	17	81	6	25	1	4
14	22	92	2	8	0	0
15	20	83	4	17	0	0
16	21	88	3	13	0	0
17	21	88	3	13	0	0
Total for Questionnaire	286	286	89	89	33	8
		408		408		408
		70%		22%		8%

Chi Square = 259.7 Significant at $p < .0001$

Goodness of Fit = 217.3767 Significant at $p < .0001$

Table IV

Summary Statistics for Secondary Student's Responses to "Student Attitude Inventory"
(N = 35)

	All of the Time		Often		Sometimes		Seldom		Never	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1	10	29	3	9	20	57	1	3	1	3
2	10	29	11	31	9	26	5	14	0	0
3	15	43	8	23	10	29	2	6	0	0
4	4	11	3	9	6	17	13	37	9	26
5	3	9	5	14	8	23	14	28	5	14
6	3	9	3	9	11	31	12	34	6	17
7	17	49	8	23	6	17	3	9	1	3
8	27	77	3	9	4	11	1	3	0	0
9	20	57	7	20	7	20	0	0	1	3
10	11	31	10	29	6	17	5	14	3	9
11	14	42	5	14	10	28	3	9	2	6
12	4	11	9	26	8	23	7	20	7	20
13	14	40	10	28	8	23	1	3	2	6
14	16	46	9	26	8	23	0	0	2	6
15	22	63	8	23	4	11	1	3	0	0
16	2	6	10	29	9	26	7	20	7	20
17	3	9	6	17	11	31	9	26	6	17
18	2	6	4	11	5	14	15	42	9	26
19	1	3	4	11	10	28	8	23	12	34
20	1	3	5	14	5	14	12	34	12	34
21	1	3	1	3	4	11	13	37	16	46
22	17	49	11	31	6	17	1	3	0	0
23	4	11	9	26	16	46	4	11	2	6
24	12	34	15	43	6	17	1	3	1	3
25	18	51	3	9	12	34	1	3	1	3
26	3	9	6	17	11	31	9	26	6	17
27	8	23	13	37	11	31	1	3	2	6
28	11	31	8	23	11	31	2	6	3	9
29	13	37	9	26	4	11	5	14	4	11
30	10	40	11	31	8	23	4	11	2	6
31	22	63	5	20	8	23	0	0	0	0
32	12	34	11	31	5	14	3	9	4	11

Total for all Responses					
N	331	233	267	163	119
	1120	1120	1120	1120	1120
%	30%	21%	24%	15%	11%

Chi Square = 126.3 — Significant at $p < .0001$
Goodness of Fit = 92.8600 — Significant at $p < .0001$

TABLE V

Frequency of Response to TESA
Program Evaluation Survey

		High				Low	Mean
		1	2	3	4	5	
*1	Communication of Objectives	8	6	3	1	0	1.67
*2	Instructional Methods Effective	6	7	4	1	0	1.83
*3	Knowledge and Understanding of TESA	11	3	4	0	0	1.61
*4	Success in Communicating	5	7	6	0	0	2.06
*5	Enthusiasm for TESA	14	2	2	0	0	1.33
*6	New Professional Ideas	2	5	6	3	2	2.89
*7	Knowledge/Practices	3	5	7	3	0	2.56
*8	Positive Attitude/Behavior Change	3	4	5	5	1	2.83
*9	Organization/Management	6	3	6	1	2	2.78
*10	Overall Rating	5	5	7	0	1	2.28

*11 Continue TESA?

Yes	N = 11
No	N = 3
Undecided	N = 4

TABLE VI
Number of Respondent Votes for
Most/Least Effective Units

Unit		Votes: First Most	Second Most	Third Most	Third Least	Second Least	First Least
	Response Strands						
1A	Equitable Distribution of Response Opportunities	5	3	-	-	-	1
2A	Individual Helping	1	-	1	-	-	-
3A	Latency	2	3	-	2	-	1
4A	Delving, Rephrasing, and Giving Clues	4	1	3	-	1	2
5A	Higher Level Questioning	-	1	-	2	2	5
	Feedback						
1B	Affirmation or Correction	1	2	2	1	-	-
2B	Praise of Learning Performance	3	3	1	-	1	-
3B	Reasons for Praise	-	2	2	2	3	-
4B	Listening	-	1	3	1	-	-
5B	Accepting Feelings	-	-	-	1	1	3
	Personal Regard						
1C	Proximity	1	-	-	1	1	2
2C	Courtesy	-	-	1	-	-	-
3C	Personal Interest and Compliments	1	2	1	2	3	1
4C	Touching	-	1	1	3	2	1
5C	Desisting	-	1	2	1	1	1

Most Favored	1A, 4A, 1B, 2B
Least Favored	5A, 4C, 3C

Appendix B

Survey Questionnaires Used in the Study

Marked by Frequency of Response

TEACHERS
TEACHING
TEACHERS

Name: _____
School: _____
Position: _____
Subject or Grade: _____
Date: _____

PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR SELF-EVALUATION

DIRECTIONS: Please answer these questions about how you feel the instruction in your classroom has changed during the past three months. Please draw a circle around the answer that is most appropriate. (Administrators answer the questions in terms of how they relate to participants of this program that are teaching at their school).

1	2	3	4	5
I Never Do This	Decreased	Stayed The Same	Increased	Done Regularly as needed

Teaching Strategy

		1	2	3	4	5
1.	I call on each student to answer questions, read aloud, or do problems on the board as often as I call on any one else.	N	0	0	7	12	8
		%	0	0	24	44	30
2.	Each student has to be prepared for the class because they never know when the teacher is going to call on them.		1	2	3	4	5
		N	0	1	11	10	5
		%	0	4	41	37	19
3.	I stand close to students' desks to talk to them and to check their classwork.		1	2	3	4	5
		N	0	0	8	7	12
		%	0	0	30	24	44
4.	I move around the room and speak to to students and/or touch them as I pass their desks.		1	2	3	4	5
		N	0	0	10	9	8
		%	0	0	37	33	30
5.	I move students around a lot so that no one has to sit in the back all the time.		1	2	3	4	5
		N	0	0	14	3	10
		%	0	0	52	11	37
6.	I expect students to think because I ask them questions they have to think about before they can answer them.		1	2	3	4	5
		N	0	0	11	8	8
		%	0	0	41	30	30
7.	I give students help when they need it.		1	2	3	4	5
		N	0	0	11	2	14
		%	0	0	41	7	52

8. I give students suggestions about how to improve their work.

	1	2	3	4	5
N	0	0	11	5	11
%	0	0	41	19	41

9. I sometimes touch students in a friendly way.

	1	2	3	4	5
N	0	0	9	7	11
%	0	0	33	24	41

10. I challenge students by expecting them to think instead of remembering answers from their books.

	1	2	3	4	5
N	0	0	13	9	5
%	0	0	48	33	19

<u>Feeling Tone</u>

11. When students break rules, they know what the consequences will be.

	1	2	3	4	5
N	0	0	15	4	8
%	0	0	56	15	30

12. I show courtesy to students by saying "Thank you" and "please" when I talk to them.

	1	2	3	4	5
N	0	0	12	6	9
%	0	0	44	22	33

13. I respect my students.

	1	2	3	4	5
N	0	0	17	4	7
%	0	0	63	15	24

14. I care about my students.

	1	2	3	4	5
N	0	0	16	4	7
%	0	0	59	15	24

15. When I call on students to answer a question, I give them time to think before they have to answer.

	1	2	3	4	5
N	0	0	7	14	6
%	0	0	24	52	22

16. I compliment students on personal things, like the way they look or things they do which are not a part of their work in class.

	1	2	3	4	5
N	0	0	9	9	9
%	0	0	33	33	33

17. I am interested in what my students do outside of school.

	1	2	3	4	5
N	0	0	16	6	5
%	0	0	59	22	19

18. I know about the pets, hobbies, family, trips taken and other personal items of my students.

	1	2	3	4	5
N	0	1	16	7	3
%	0	4	59	24	11

19. I like my students.

	1	2	3	4	5
N	0	0	20	3	4
%	0	0	74	11	15

<u>Success</u>

20. When a student answers a question, the teacher tells them right away if their answer is correct or not.

	1	2	3	4	5
N	0	0	11	11	5
%	0	0	41	41	19

		1	2	3	4	5
21. I want my students to do well in school.	N	0	0	18	3	6
	%	0	0	67	11	22
		1	2	3	4	5
22. I show students who do well that I am pleased.	N	0	0	12	6	9
23. I praise students who answer questions correctly or do well on classwork.	%	0	0	44	22	33
		1	2	3	4	5
24. When students do really good work on an assignment, I tell them exactly what is good about the work.	N	0	0	9	9	9
	%	0	0	33	33	33
		1	2	3	4	5
	N	0	0	9	14	4
	%	0	0	33	52	15
		1	2	3	4	5
25. I tell students why I like what they accomplish.	N	0	0	13	8	6
	%	0	0	48	30	22
		1	2	3	4	5
26. I show students' work to the class and praise what they have done.	N	0	0	12	9	6
	%	0	0	44	33	22
		1	2	3	4	5
27. When students have troubles answering a question, I give them clues to help them get the answer.	N	0	0	8	12	7
	%	0	0	30	44	24
		1	2	3	4	5
28. I listen to students when they talk to me, even when I am busy.	N	0	0	10	12	5
	%	0	0	37	44	19
		1	2	3	4	5
29. Students know that I am listening to them because I look at them when I talk to them.	N	0	0	12	11	4
	%	0	0	44	41	15
		1	2	3	4	5
30. I understand how students feel when something bad or good has happened to them.	N	0	0	17	7	3
	%	0	0	63	24	11
		1	2	3	4	5
31. I accept the feelings of my students.	N	0	0	16	8	3
32. If a student breaks a rule or disobeys me, they are made to feel that I still like them even though I am upset about what she/he did.	%	0	0	59	30	11
		1	2	3	4	5
	N	0	0	15	10	2
	%	0	0	56	37	7

Teachers Name_____

Teaching Student No._____ Date_____

Teachers Teacher_____

School_____

ABOUT MY TEACHER

Directions: During the next few minutes you are going to answer some questions about your teacher. If the answer to a question is no, draw an X through the word No. If the answer to a question is sometimes, draw an X through the word Sometimes. If the answer to a question is yes, draw an X through the word yes.

		Yes	Sometimes	No
1.	My teacher calls on me as often as everyone else.	N 10 % 41	12 50	2 8
2.	When I answer a question, my teacher tells me if my answer is right or wrong.	N 18 % 75	4 17	2 8
3.	My teacher stands close to my desk to talk to me or to check my work.	N 13 % 54	7 29	4 17
4.	When my teacher speaks to students, he/she often touches them.	N 4 % 17	12 50	8 33
5.	My teacher likes me.	N 22 % 92	2 8	0 0
6.	My teacher wants me to do a good job at school.	N 24 % 100	0 0	0 0
7.	My teacher gives me help when I need it.	N 7 % 81	6 6	1 4

©
Professional School Services
David Alan Gilman, Ph.D.
1315 School of Education
Indiana State University
Terre Haute, IN 47809

		Yes	Sometimes	No
8.	My teacher thinks I'm a neat kid.	N 16 % 67	8 33	0 0
9.	My teacher cares about me.	Yes N 23 % 96	Sometimes 1 4	No 0 0
10.	My teacher tells me why she/he likes things I do in class.	Yes N 14 % 58	Sometimes 8 33	No 2 6
11.	My teacher shows my work to the class.	Yes N 7 % 29	Sometimes 8 33	No 9 38
12.	My teacher knows about my pets, family, and trips I've taken.	Yes N 17 % 81	Sometimes 3 13	No 4 17
13.	When I can't answer a question, my teacher gives me help.	Yes N 17 % 81	Sometimes 6 25	No 1 4
14.	My teacher listens when I talk.	Yes N 22 % 92	Sometimes 2 8	No 0 0
15.	My teacher understands how I feel when something good or bad has happened to me.	Yes N 20 % 83	Sometimes 4 17	No 0 0
16.	If I break my teacher's rules, I know what will happen.	Yes N 21 % 88	Sometimes 3 13	No 0 0
17.	If I break a rule or disobey, my teacher still likes me.	Yes N 21 % 88	Sometimes 3 13	No 0 0

TEACHERS TEACHING TEACHERS
STUDENT ATTITUDE INVENTORY
STUDENT ATTITUDE TOWARD INSTRUCTION

This is not a test of information. Therefore, there is no one "right" answer to a question. We are interested in your opinion on each of the statements below. Your opinions will be confidential. Do not hesitate to put down exactly how you feel about each item. We are trying to get information, not compliments. Please be frank. If you don't understand a question, ask someone for help.

NAME_____ DATE _____

NAME OF TEACHER_____

CLASS _____

1. My teacher calls on me to answer questions, read aloud, or do problems on the board as often as she/he calls on everyone else.

	Most of the time :	Often :	Sometimes :	Seldom :	Never
N	10	3	20	1	1
%		9	57	3	3

2. I have to be prepared in this class because I never know when my teacher is going to call on me to answer.

	Most of the time :	Often :	Sometimes :	Seldom :	Never
N	10	11	9	5	0
%	29	31	26	14	0

3. When I answer a question, my teacher tells me right away if my answer is correct or not.

	Most of the time :	Often :	Sometimes :	Seldom :	Never
N	15	8	10	2	0
%	43	23	29	6	0

4. My teacher stands close to my desk at times during the day to talk to me or to check my classwork.

	Most of the time :	Often :	Sometimes :	Seldom :	Never
N	4	3	6	13	9
%	11	9	17	37	26

5. My teacher moves around the room speaking to students and/or touching them as he/she passes their desks.

	Most of the time :	Often :	Sometimes :	Seldom :	Never
N	3	5	8	14	5
%	9	14	23	28	14

6. My teacher moves students around a lot so no one has to sit in the back all the time.

	Most of the time	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
N	3	3	11	12	6
%	9	9	31	34	17

7. My teacher cares about me.

	Most of the time	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
N	17	8	6	3	1
%	49	23	17	9	3

8. My teacher wants me to do well in school.

	Most of the time	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
N	27	3	4	1	0
%	77	9	11	3	0

9. My teacher gives me help when I need it.

	Most of the time	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
N	20	7	7	0	1
%	57	20	20	0	3

10. My teacher gives me suggestions on how to improve my work.

	Most of the time	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
N	11	10	6	5	3
%	31	29	17	14	9

11. My teacher shows that he/she is pleased when I do well in my learning activities.

	Most of the time	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
N	15	5	10	3	2
%	42	14	28	9	6

12. My teacher praises me when I answer questions correctly or do well on classwork.

	Most of the time	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
N	4	9	8	7	7
%	11	29	23	20	20

13. My teacher shows courtesy to me by saying "Thank you" and "Please" when he/she talks to me.

	Most of the time	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
N	14	10	8	1	2
%	40	28	23	3	6

14. My teacher respects me.

	Most of the time	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
N	16	9	8	0	2
%	46	26	23	0	6

15. When my teacher calls on me to answer a question, he/she gives me time to think before I have to answer.

	Most of the time	: Often	: Sometimes	: Seldom	: Never
N	22	8	4	1	0
%	63	23	11	3	0

16. My teacher tells me why he/she likes what I accomplish in this class.

	Most of the time	: Often	: Sometimes	: Seldom	: Never
N	2	10	9	7	7
%	6	29	26	20	20

17. When I do really good work on an assignment, my teacher tells me exactly what is good about my work.

	Most of the time	: Often	: Sometimes	: Seldom	: Never
N	3	6	11	9	6
%	9	17	31	26	17

18. My teacher sometimes shows my work to the class and praises what I have done.

	Most of the time	: Often	: Sometimes	: Seldom	: Never
N	2	4	5	15	9
%	6	11	14	42	26

19. My teacher compliments me on personal things, like the way I look or things I do which are not a part of our work in class.

	Most of the time	: Often	: Sometimes	: Seldom	: Never
N	1	4	10	8	12
%	3	11	28	23	34

20. My teacher is interested in what I do outside of school.

	Most of the time	: Often	: Sometimes	: Seldom	: Never
N	1	5	5	12	12
%	3	14	14	34	34

21. My teacher knows about my pets, hobbies, family, trips I've taken, and other personal things.

	Most of the time	: Often	: Sometimes	: Seldom	: Never
N	1	1	4	13	16
%	3	3	11	37	46

22. When I am having trouble answering a question, my teacher gives me clues to help me get the answer

	Most of the time	: Often	: Sometimes	: Seldom	: Never
N	17	11	6	1	0
%	49	31	17	3	0

23. My teacher listens to me when I talk to her/him, even when she/he is busy.

	Most of the time	: Often	: Sometimes	: Seldom	: Never
N	4	9	16	4	2
%	11	26	46	11	6

24. I know my teacher listens to me when I talk to her/him because she/he looks at me.

	Most of the time	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
N	12	15	6	1	1
%	34	43	17	3	3

25. My teacher likes me.

	Most of the time	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
N	18	3	12	1	1
%	51	9	34	3	3

26. My teacher sometimes touches students in a friendly way.

	Most of the time	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
N	3	6	11	9	6
%	9	17	31	26	17

27. My teacher expects me to think because she/he asks me questions that I have to think about before I can answer.

	Most of the time	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
N	8	13	11	1	2
%	23	37	31	3	6

28. My teacher challenges me because he/she expects me to think instead of just remembering answers from the book.

	Most of the time	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
N	11	8	11	2	3
%	31	23	31	6	9

29. My teacher understands how I feel when something bad or good has happened to me.

	Most of the time	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
N	31	9	4	5	4
%	37	26	11	14	11

30. My teacher accepts my feelings.

	Most of the time	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
N	10	11	8	4	2
%	40	31	23	11	6

31. If I choose to break my teacher's rules, I know what the consequences will be.

	Most of the time	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
N	22	5	8	0	0
%	63	20	23	0	0

32. When I break a rule or disobey the teacher, I know that she/he still likes me even if she/he is upset with what I did.

	Most of the time	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Never
N	12	11	5	3	4
%	34	31	14	9	11

TESA — PROGRAM EVALUATION SURVEY

Frequencies of Responses are in Tables V and VI

District: ___ ___ _____ School Year: _____

Please check the appropriate answer to each item below.

Sex: Male ☐ Female ☐ Years in profession: 1-5 ☐ 6-10 ☐ 11-15 ☐ 16+ ☐

Age: 20-25 ☐ 26-30 ☐ 31-35 ☐ 36-40 ☐ 41-45 ☐ 46+ ☐

Your major assignment: Administrator ☐ Aide ☐ Counselor ☐ Teacher ☐ Other ☐

Grade level assignment: K-3 ☐ 4-6 ☐ 7-8 ☐ 9-12 ☐ College/University ☐

PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER THAT BEST REPRESENTS YOUR ANSWER TO THE QUESTION ASKED.

1.	To what degree were the objectives of the TESA program clearly communicated to you?	1. High 1 2 3 4 5 Low
2.	To what degree were the methods employed by the instructor(s) effective in achieving the objectives?	2. High 1 2 3 4 5 Low
3.	To what degree did the instructor(s) demonstrate a thorough knowledge and understanding of TESA concepts?	3. High 1 2 3 4 5 Low
4.	To what degree did the instructor(s) succeed in communicating TESA concepts?	4. High 1 2 3 4 5 Low
5.	To what degree did the instructor(s) demonstrate enthusiasm for the TESA program?	5. High 1 2 3 4 5 Low
6.	To what degree did the TESA program introduce you to new professional ideas?	6. High 1 2 3 4 5 Low
7.	To what degree did the TESA program provide you with applied and functional knowledge and practices?	7. High 1 2 3 4 5 Low
8.	To what degree did your involvement in the TESA program result in positive changes in your attitude and behavior toward perceived "lows"?	8. High 1 2 3 4 5 Low
9.	To what degree was the program well organized and managed?	9. High 1 2 3 4 5 Low
10.	What is your overall rating of the TESA program?	10. High 1 2 3 4 5 Low
11.	Do you believe TESA should continue as a staff inservice training program in your district?	11. Yes ☐ No ☐ Undecided ☐

UNIT	STRAND A RESPONSE OPPORTUNITIES	STRAND B FEEDBACK	STRAND C PERSONAL REGARD
1	1A Equitable Distribution of Response Opportunities	1B Affirmation or Correction	1C Proximity (within arm's reach of student)
2	2A Individual Helping	2B Praise of Learning Performance	2C Courtesy
3	3A Latency (waiting time for student to respond)	3B Reasons for Praise	3C Personal Interest and Compliments
4	4A Delving, Rephrasing, and Giving Clues	4B Listening	4C Touching
5	5A Higher Level Questioning	5B Accepting Feelings	5C Desisting

In the above diagram of the Interaction Model, each of the interactions has been coded according to UNIT-STRAND (e.g., Latency = 3A, Courtesy = 2C). In the spaces below, prioritize the three (3) interactions you believe were *most effective* in bringing about positive change with your perceived "lows"; then prioritize the three which you believe were the *least effective*.

	Code		Code
1st most effective	_____	1st least effective	_____
2nd most effective	_____	2nd least effective	_____
3rd most effective	_____	3rd least effective	_____